

September 16, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21861

registered citizens became registered voters.

Because of this successful Dothan project, several other Alabama Jaycee Clubs have also conducted voter registration drives.

One of the most recent projects undertaken by the Dothan Jaycees was their Labor Day safety program. From 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., these young men manned booths on the busy highways in and around Dothan, stopping Labor Day traffic and providing travelers with safety literature, bagged peanuts, and cold drinks. More than 3,000 bags of peanuts and 12,000 drinks were given to occupants of almost 4,000 cars.

The Dothan Jaycees are to be further congratulated for their successful efforts to elect one of their own as president of the Alabama Jaycees. Mr. Jimmy Grant, past president of the Dothan club, was elevated to the high position of State Jaycee president at the Jaycees State convention in May. Thus, Mr. Grant became the second Dothan Jaycee to be so honored within the last 4 years.

The Dothan Jaycees are to be congratulated for their efforts to improve the community life of the people of Dothan. These young men of action take seriously their job of leadership training and community development. But in addition to serving their own community, the Dothan Jaycees feel a distinct responsibility to the entire south Alabama region. As a result, they have been directly responsible for the formation of Jaycee Clubs in the neighboring towns of Ashford, Headland, Hartford, and Ozark.

I think the record of the Dothan Jaycees speaks for itself. I think that it is a record of positive action by positive young leaders.

It is a record built on the concept of free enterprise.

It is a record built on the concept of democracy.

It is a record built on the concept of individual initiative.

And Mr. President, it is a record of which I am truly proud. I commend these young men and take great pride and pleasure in calling their efforts to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate.

UN
PROTECT SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the New Orleans Times-Picayune has probed the realities in Vietnam and emerged with this reasoned conclusion:

The United States can only continue what it is doing. And that, in the newspaper's words, is to "help protect South Vietnam in such a way as to persuade North Vietnam to end its aggression."

In an editorial criticizing the recent Vietnamese proposals of General de Gaulle, the Times-Picayune observes that our current policy cannot lead to a larger war unless the other side wishes to make it one.

Unless the Communists decided to seek negotiations now, the New Orleans paper contends, the best prospect for eventual peace is a U.S. presence that balks a Communist victory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, entitled "De Gaulle No Help," printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Times-Picayune, New Orleans, La., Sept. 5, 1966]

DE GAULLE NO HELP

President De Gaulle, who likes the image of the disinterested, realistic, Gallic logician, has not done that image much good in his Cambodian speech on Viet Nam, and in the communique jointly issued with Prince Sihanouk. His key points were that the United States should withdraw, or at least agree to withdraw, its troops as a necessary condition for peace talks; and that a negotiated settlement of the war should follow the lines of the 1954 Geneva agreements.

The first is unrealistic, for U.S. withdrawal would mean immediate takeover of all Viet Nam by the north. The second begs a most crucial question, for the 1954 agreements are, when assembled and read closely, a collection of contradictory and confusing statements, and unstated assumptions, on which very little of the concrete could be based.

President De Gaulle refers invariably to "Viet Nam" as though there were only one nation, not two nations; and asserts that once foreign (American) interference in the war ends, a settlement acceptable to "all Vietnamese" will be possible. In view of the realities—not the "legal" realities, for these could be sought for years without being found, but the "real realities" (the attempted North Vietnamese blitzkrieg against relatively helpless brethren)—that view is palpable nonsense.

The U.S. is in South Viet Nam on invitation and on principle to help it survive. The decision for ending the war, by withdrawal or by negotiation, rests entirely with Hanoi, which has apparently retained enough independence of its "foreign interferers" (Red China and the Soviet Union) to be able to make it. Yet Hanoi has again rejected peace talks, until the U.S. has pulled out entirely.

The U.S., therefore, can only continue what it is doing: help protect South Viet Nam in such a way as to persuade North Viet Nam to end its aggression. This cannot lead to a larger war unless the other side wishes to make it one. The best prospect of eventual peace, unless North Viet Nam, Red China, and the Soviet Union decide to grasp the nettle of negotiations now, is a U.S. presence that balks a Communist victory, and makes a heavier attempt for one an unacceptable alternative because of the obvious dangers.

PHILOSOPHY OF WAR ON POVERTY—STATEMENT BY MAYOR JEROME P. CAVANAGH OF DETROIT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Jerome P. Cavanagh, the youthful and remarkably successful mayor of the city of Detroit, recently discussed the philosophy of the war on poverty with directors of community action programs in the Midwest States.

His speech is worth noting for several reasons.

First, Jerry Cavanagh is president of both the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors—so his attitudes are not likely to be provincial ones.

Second, The war on poverty program in Detroit has been one of the most efficient and successful in the Nation.

Mayor Cavanagh foresightedly warns that the war on poverty program is frankly designed to effect a change in the economic and social makeup of the Nation.

This change, however desirable, will not be without difficulty—simply because change is always, in some measure, difficult.

But he warns that we not allow a few disagreeable side effects to be used as an excuse to destroy or dilute a worthwhile program. He has some sharp reminders for all of us in the matter of priorities—putting men on the moon as against putting men on their feet in renewed neighborhoods in our Nation's cities.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS BY JEROME P. CAVANAGH, MAYOR, CITY OF DETROIT, PRESIDENT, UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS AND PRESIDENT, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, BEFORE THE URBAN AREAS CONFERENCE GREAT LAKES REGION, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, AUGUST 22, 1966

I was pleased to accept Phil Rutledge's invitation to both welcome you to Detroit and salute this entire concept of an "urban areas" conference. This meeting is extremely important. It permits you to share your experiences in the War on Poverty and comes at a time when the entire nation is looking at the urban crisis.

Tomorrow, I will represent Detroit and both the United States Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities before the Ribicoff-Senate Committee. Hopefully one impact of that committee's hearing will be to sharply change our national perspective about the plight of cities.

It is no coincidence that the Ribicoff committee has spent a considerable amount of time exploring the impact of the wide range of urban programs which affect the poor. Testimony last week has brought some startling admissions and a damaging indictment of a society which still does not adequately house, feed, educate, protect or provide opportunities for growth for many of its people.

Just as Michael Harrington did so much to publicize "The Other America" on a national level, these Senate hearings are serving to focus attention on that other city—the often neglected inner city, the neighborhoods of poverty which concern us all as residents, mayors or workers in anti-poverty programs.

Most of what has been said at these hearings is not really news to most of us. We are occupied on a daily basis with the problems of slums, inadequate education, disjointed and often irrelevant welfare services. But these hearings can, with our help, lead to a serious rethinking of many of the programs designed to promote social changes in America today.

The War on Poverty, launched on a hopeful and imaginative level, has begun to settle back just when it needs a strong forward push.

And at the same time, it is increasingly coming under partisan political attack by those trying to push it even farther back.

The answer to this problem comes not only from the Ribicoff hearings, which will hopefully outline the scope of the desperation faced by the poor in our cities, but also it must come from you here today. If we have in operation in our Antipoverty Programs in the major cities strong programs that meet the needs of the poor and are

21862

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 16, 1969

making headway, then I believe we will be strong enough to take on any criticism.

So we must continually analyze what we are doing, make the most of the limited funds available to us and move together in seeking broader funding for the entire program.

Presently, things are moving in the wrong direction.

In Detroit, our TAP program is increasingly receiving letters from OEO offices expressing regret that some of our programs cannot be funded because of "insufficient funds."

Day-to-day uncertainty grips many of our existing programs and a sword of Damocles marked "insufficient funds" hangs menacingly over too many needed services.

It is hard for me to reconcile the apparent contradiction of a society in which the Gross National Product soars annually and the bank of the promised Great Society appears to border on a state of bankruptcy.

The explanations which justify cutbacks or deferrals usually start with the word "inflation" and end with the word "Vietnam." But whatever explanation is given, it is clear that the "War on Poverty" and the vast needs of our nation's cities do not share the same priorities as the defense program or the space program.

Yet, in the long run, the War on Poverty is more important than the War in Vietnam. Putting men on their feet in renewed neighborhoods in our nation's cities is just as important as putting a man on the moon. Conquering poverty will have greater meaning to the underdeveloped and uncommitted nations of the world than a space station.

So basically what we are talking about is the reordering of our national priorities by placing the needs of America's dispossessed and denied high on the national agenda.

Our efforts must be to strengthen our anti-poverty programs. The output for the entire War on Poverty is far too low as it is. We have made a commitment to the poor and we do not appear to be living up to it.

I would warn you, however, that there is every indication that the War on Poverty will face a broad-scale attack by at least one political party—the one I do not belong to—and others who fear any breakup in the status quo. Those attacks are simmering beneath the surface in many communities and quite open in others. Yet through our efforts I am convinced that we can and must keep our nation moving forward. What has been done must not be undone.

As you know, there have been moves made in Congress to cut back or hold funding of the Poverty Program at its current level. This is being done in the face of rising costs, in the face of broadening responsibility, in the face of increasing need and in the face of early success.

It strikes me, too, that the main critics of the program have been those who cry out for more local initiative, for more local control, for less federal meddling. These critics, while launching broad scale attacks on what they call excessive federalism, are carefully taking one of the truly creative programs—one of the truly locally controlled programs—and designing rigid federal controls over it.

They want more federal guidelines. They want earmarking of funds. They want more rigidity and less local choice.

The situation, gentlemen, verges on the ridiculous.

The critics of the War on Poverty want us to turn away from local initiative.

The critics of the War on Poverty want to limit the right of local communities to plan their own poverty programs.

Make no mistake about it—there have been problems in determining how Community Action Programs should be administered, how the poor should be involved. But when we began this struggle to end poverty

no one said the job would be easy. Innovation and change never is.

In some communities bitter battles—about who should control what—have paralyzed programs in their infancy.

In Detroit, we have our tensions and conflicts but TAP operates a broad range of effective programs—in the areas of health, community services, job training and education. They involve the poor and still occasionally manage the maximum feasible participation of local officials.

In other places like Harlem, things have been more difficult.

In a recent article, Murray Kempton reported a meeting of the HARYOU agency "which had been suspended by an intrusion in whose course the chairman of the board appeared to have been bopped by a young man of the indigenous category. Kids who might have been dropping bricks off roofs," he says, somewhat cynically, "are now pushing around directors of the poverty program in board rooms."

But these are some of the tensions associated with a unique program which is concerned about involving people in the decision-making process—people who are, often with great justification, bitter and frustrated by years of broken promises and governmental inaction.

But if we are truly to share power with the poor, we must expect such problems.

Programmatically, even in its broadest terms the War on Poverty does not now provide the wide coverage pledged in preamble to the Economic Opportunity Act. Nevertheless, the Community Action Programs have aroused the nation and legitimized extensive governmental concern about the paradox of poverty in a land of plenty.

So we must become concerned with the broad political context which affects the war on poverty and become even more active than we are in demonstrating the essential validity of comprehensive programs which reach out to offer services which reject the old welfare paternalism, and which seek to crack the vicious cycle of poverty.

But at the same time, we must set our own house in order. We must push for basic changes in the makeup and direction of our own city departments. Obviously the persistence of the poor means that our dollars spent over the years on a local level have not touched the problem.

In the city of Detroit, we commissioned a study by the Greenleigh Associates as part of our Community Renewal Program which pointed out the deficiencies in the existing service programs to the poor.

Based on interviews with 2000 low-income residents, that study told us that vast changes were needed in the style, attitude, direction and the level of expenditure spent by almost all Detroit's public and voluntary agencies.

We used many of the findings of that report in designing the TAP program and are moving—perhaps not fast enough—to reorganize and humanize many of the city departments which were found so deficient.

There is a great deal of unfinished business in Detroit as there is in every urban area in America. Part of the job of the poverty program and citizens alike as I see it is to help sensitize public officials to the full dimensions of the problems and provide new and realistic directions for change.

Frederick Douglass, the great Negro abolitionist pointed out long ago that there could be no change without struggle and no struggle without pain.

The risks however are necessary because the needs are so real.

If we are, as the Office of Economic Opportunity claims, seeking not to ameliorate poverty but to abolish it and if we are to do it within ten years—then we will have to invest billions of dollars in education, in

creating thousands of new jobs, in building new hospitals and housing, and in extending the reality of justice and democracy to all of our citizens.

I am convinced that such a goal is both desirable and attainable.

Such a goal requires that we in the cities of this nation do more than set up a new bureau and leave the rest of the city operation untouched—leave it to operate as it has for decades.

It requires that the human touch—the outreach into the community which has characterized the antipoverty approach—be brought into every city department.

Presently, we have largely set our poverty programs up as parallel service institutions. Now we must scale the hardest walls of all. We must integrate the OEO approach into our existing departments—make them broad based, responsive to a wide variety of community needs.

This is a tough job because city departments are designed to meet needs of the public. But we must convince our fellow professionals that in many cases their programs are not being as effective as they can be.

You job as poverty officials is to help bring about these changes in the departmental operations of your cities where the majority of city funds are spent.

Yours must be the creative, innovative voice in city government.

Yours must be the voice that does not lose touch with problems on the street.

Yours must be the voice for change.

As a young man told me on the street the other day:

"We can make it if we try."

VOTE VICTORY IN VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, our delight at the magnificent turnout of voters for the elections in South Vietnam is widely shared by commentators in the press who are well qualified by experience to analyze world affairs.

William S. White, for instance, hails the impressive vote as a victory for American policy of measureless importance. Mr. White, the highly respected columnist, interprets the word "policy" in this case as "a bipartisan stance of strength in travail and of steadfast honor in piled-up adversity."

Two of our major newspapers, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin and the Chicago Sun-Times, also regard the elections as a triumph for the cause of freedom.

On their editorial pages these newspapers call the elections an encouraging first step toward establishing representative government in South Vietnam. The Sun-Times, in fact, declares the people of South Vietnam made a necessary political rejection of communism by going to the polls in vast number despite Vietcong terrorism.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. White's column and both editorials on the elections.

There being no objection, the column and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Sept. 14, 1968]

BIG VOTE IN VIETNAM IS MAJOR TRIUMPH FOR U.S. POLICY

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The long nightmare of Vietnam is lifting at last and though the way to

September 16, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21863

final victory over the Communist assailants from without and within still stretches out long and forbidding, a true pre-dawn does now loom out faintly ahead.

This is the real meaning of the spectacular success for the people of South Vietnam. In the teeth of tireless terrorism from the Communist they have voted in better than 80 percent of their total strength in a free election.

They are going now to make a democratic constitution by orderly and democratic means. To all the world they have issued, moreover, a thundering rebuke to all those—the Communist, the fellow-travelers, the merely deluded peaceniks and beatniks—who for years have peddled the monstrous fiction that the Communist Vietcong were in truth popular in South Vietnam and were only engaged in a "democratic revolution."

By immense majorities the South Vietnamese themselves have forever destroyed this big lie version of current history.

By immense majorities they have shown their determination both to keep their country from the reaching grasp of internal and external Communist trigger men and to make of it a decent state in Asia.

This is a victory for American policy of measureless importance—not for Democratic policy and not for Republican policy but for a bipartisan stance of strength in travail and of steadfast honor in piled-up adversity. To this splendid end the Republicans, and notably the party's leading figures in and out of Congress, have contributed with memorable generosity and magnificent concern for the vital, non political interests of this Nation and of all the Free World.

In the narrower sense, of course, it is a triumph for the Democratic President who has risked most in Vietnam and the President who has borne the heaviest of the burden from a constantly biting democratic New Left at home and the incessantly destructive carping that has come from some of our alleged friends, such as Charles de Gaulle of France.

But if Lyndon B. Johnson is vindicated in this historic hour so, too, are Dwight Eisenhower, and John Kennedy before him, and so are such Republicans as the Senate Minority Leader, EVERETT DIRKSEN of Illinois, and Richard Nixon and Senator JACOB JAVITS of New York and many another of lesser rank and place.

Will it all help Democratic Congressional candidates in November's elections? No doubt it will assist most of them, since most have stood all along with this Nation's pledge to stay the course in Vietnam. No doubt, too, it may improve the President's "image" in the opinion polls.

To look for a two-bit domestic partisan credit or gain in this transcendental victory for a tortured people and for an old concept called the right to freedom—to freedom even in Asia—would be little-minded beyond belief. For what has happened in Vietnam can scarcely be described without the use of superlative heaped upon superlative.

For the first time in the Cold War a nation under Communist attack not only from abroad but at home has been able to conduct a free election as free men.

The so-called "war of liberation" as a special instrument of Communist China lies in ruins in the now deserted balloting places of South Vietnam for the cynical and evil fraud it has always been.

The Red Chinese have been thrown back as never before. The policy of a rationally restrained but absolutely determined military resistance to Chinese aggression-by-proxy has been proved beyond all doubt to be not only one of honor but one of effectiveness as well.

Over Asia the long darkness is lifting, at least, though not yet dispersed. The Chinese wave of the future is not, after all, to be the wave of the future for Asia, just as

Hitler's wave of the future broke at length two decades ago upon the great rock of resolute Allied resistance.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, Sept. 13, 1966]

FIRST STEP IN SOUTH VIETNAM

With due account for all deficiencies, Sunday's election for a constituent assembly in South Vietnam must be regarded as a singular achievement. The high turnout in spite of Viet Cong terrorism and threats of assassination of voters and candidates alike gives the lie to Viet Cong and Hanoi claims of their hold on the affections of the people.

It also confounds foreign critics who called the election undertaking a farce. Even with a fair percentage of blank protest ballots, the fact that three-fourths of the eligibles voted was a demonstration that the South Vietnamese are not as apathetic as they have been pictured. The government headed by Premier Ky prodded people to vote, but no evidence of undue pressures has come to light.

Of special significance was the heavier than average voting in the region around Hue and Da Nang, the center of the Buddhist Institute's recent revolt against Saigon and of its campaign to boycott the elections. This campaign was an obvious failure.

One does not have to accept Premier Ky's prediction that the elections mark the beginning of the end of the Communists, but a forward step certainly has been taken. A long road lies ahead, and the 117-man constituent assembly has it within its power to lay the foundations for a broader representative government that will remove the stigma of a military junta allegedly ruling with an iron fist.

The quality of the assembly, which begins its work on September 28, has yet to be proven. The government has retained a veto over its work, but it can override a veto with a two-thirds vote. The kind of constitution the assembly will write will depend upon the abilities of its members. They can go about their task in a far different spirit than they could have if the Viet Cong and the Buddhists had been successful in sabotaging the elections.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Sept. 13, 1966]

BALLOTS AND BULLETS

The election in South Viet Nam shapes up as a stinging defeat for the Communists. It is, also, a victory for the military government of South Viet Nam and, in no small part, for the United States.

More than 83 per cent of those eligible to vote went to the polls. It is the size of this turnout that inflicts the defeat on the Communists.

If the full-scale guerrilla warfare the Communists are carrying on in South Viet Nam is to succeed, the guerrillas must control the civilian population, by one means or another. The Communist Viet Cong carried out an intense campaign of terror to keep the voters at home on election day. The fact that four out of five of those eligible did vote, braving the real danger of death, injury, and post-election retaliation at the hands of the Communists, is proof the Communists do not control the populace.

It is also a clear indication that the South Vietnamese approve of the efforts made by their military government and the United States to resist Communist aggression. This approval has been shown before, in surveys. Now it has been demonstrated at the voting booths. The theory held by some that the South Vietnamese want the United States to get out of Viet Nam so they can go their own way, accepting the fact of communism, is upset. It is the Communists the South Vietnamese want to get out, not the United States forces.

The war in Viet Nam is a political as well as military effort. The battle is for the minds of men as well as to resist Communist aggression. Unless there is a political rejection of communism, a military victory in Viet Nam would be, for the most part, meaningless.

The people of South Viet Nam have made that rejection by going to the polls in great numbers despite Communist terrorism. They have shown that they want to create a political system that will allow them to live in a democratic society.

That is a defeat the Communists cannot disown. It is also a rebuff to those Western nations that are critical of U.S. policy in Viet Nam. President Johnson should again remind those nations of their responsibility to help the United States preserve freedom in the world.

GOVERNMENT WITHOUT HONOR

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the September 14, 1966, issue of the Washington Daily News entitled "Government Without Honor."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT WITHOUT HONOR

A 12-year-old Negro child, his leg broken, was forced to crawl a gantlet of screaming white men swinging ax handles and chains. Finally, weeping, bruised and bleeding, the boy was rescued and taken to a hospital.

This gives an idea of the senseless mob in front of the Grenada, Miss., schools Monday. It is easy to agree with Mississippi Gov. Paul Johnson that they were the dregs of that northern Mississippi community. But what will you say of the police who stood by, refusing to act? Grenada officials, in the words of the suit filed yesterday by the Justice Department, knew that there was "imminent danger" and "wilfully failed to provide adequate protection . . . when Negro children were to commence classes."

Gov. Johnson moved in state troopers late in the day, announcing that "those who raise the sword of violence will be met by the sword of law enforcement." If those trite and vainglorious words mean someone is going to be arrested and punished, we await some news of it. The troopers arrested no one Tuesday, when children again were harassed.

Incidentally, three newsmen, two from a sister Scripps-Howard newspaper, The Memphis Press-Scimitar, also were beaten by the mob. This raises the question of freedom of the press, but savages who would thus mistreat innocent children hardly could be expected to respect, or even remotely comprehend, the subtler safeguards of the U.S. Constitution. Newsmen who try to keep the public informed in such cases take chances similar to those covering the war in Viet Nam. Those who went to Grenada Monday were lucky to escape with only cuts and bruises.

There is no excuse either for the black mobsters in Atlanta, Chicago and other cities. But at least they haven't deliberately mistreated children. They have, after a fashion at least, picked on someone their own size—albeit children have suffered from their acts.

Much of the unrest and feeling of frustration in this country stems from failure of government, local, state and national, to enforce the laws against crime—cringing in fear of political consequences if they challenge these criminals, black or white. This has encouraged disrespect for all law, as is evidenced by the crime rate—up eight percent from last year according to the FBI report, just made public.

21864

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 16, 1966

Enforcement of domestic order is a first obligation of government—an obligation repeatedly defaulted by officialdom both North and South. Until our various subdivisions of government perform their routine police functions, there can be little hope of rational settlement in the nagging problem of civil rights. Ours is a Government in grave danger of losing the respect of its people.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FOOD MARKETING STUDY SHOWS DAIRY FARMER LOW MAN ON TOTEM POLE

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, during the past few months, as I have discussed the need for a strengthened special milk program for schoolchildren, I have emphasized the contribution the program has made not only to the Nation's schoolchildren, but also to the dairy farmer.

I have pointed out on numerous occasions that low dairy prices are driving the dairy farmer into other pursuits with a consequent drop in milk production which will ultimately result in a milk shortage and inflationary milk price increases. The school milk program counters this trend by stimulating the consumption of fluid milk which otherwise might have to be purchased and stored under the price support program. Of course, the dairy farmer makes more money if he can sell his fluid milk at market prices rather than selling it as manufacturing milk to the Government at price support levels.

The serious plight of the dairy farmer was recently emphasized by a report of the National Commission on Food Marketing on the Dairy Industry. The report showed that dairy farmers in the Central Northeast earned a return of 61 cents an hour in 1964, grade A dairy farmers in eastern Wisconsin earned 84 cents an hour, grade B dairy farmers in eastern Wisconsin earned 36 cents an hour, and grade B dairy farmers in western Wisconsin earned a miserably meager 30 cents an hour. This compares with an average return of \$1.19 an hour to broiler farmers in Maine, \$2.13 an hour to cash grain farmers in the Corn Belt, and \$2.37 to \$2.86 for dairy plant workers.

These statistics indicate just why the dairy industry is in such serious trouble. Until we begin to give the proper emphasis to programs that help the dairy farmer, such as the school milk program, the trouble will worsen. This is one reason why I am fighting hard for final passage of legislation extending the school milk, as well as additional funds for the program in fiscal 1967.

BISHOP JAMES A. PIKE—STATEMENT BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several days ago at a morning breakfast meeting held in Washington, attended by a number of Senators and other civic leaders, the noted columnist, David Lawrence, made a presentation which may be of interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His presentation provoked considerable discussion.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that a copy of it be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bishop James A. Pike of the Episcopal Church in California has resigned to become identified as a scholar with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, California, which is operated by the Ford Foundation. In his farewell sermon at Grace Cathedral on Nob Hill in San Francisco a week ago Sunday, he made some statements which were carried over the wires of the United Press International and I chose them for some comment and analysis today. For Bishop Pike said he could not affirm the existence of an "all powerful . . . all good . . . all knowing" God. He said that the church has been "affirming many, too many things—things that are unverifiable, things that are absolutely contrary to the facts, things which are irrelevant, things which are not important if they were true." He added:

"You look at the data. You look at what is . . . There is only one breadth, the secular. There is no supernatural. If something is true, it is natural. If it's not natural, it's not true. . . .

"I am willing to infer a little beyond the data . . . that this is a universe and there is a 'unus'—a one.

"We cannot really affirm much more. We cannot extrapolate to the sky and say that He is omni-this and omni-that. I don't know all that much. . . . We see a bit of order and we say He's omnipotent, omnipresent, He's omniscient, omniscient.

"What's the data for all that? When we affirm that He is all powerful, all good, all knowing, we set ourselves up for the biggest theological fall in history.

"When you set it up that He is all good, all knowing and also all powerful—then why are things in such a mess? Why is there so much disorder?"

Now we must bear in mind that James A. Pike started his career as an attorney. He still retains his membership in the American Bar Association. He was trained in the precision of the law. He is accustomed to explicit proof. There must be, he thinks, evidence to prove everything "beyond a shadow of a doubt."

But I do not attribute Bishop Pike's interpretation wholly to such a propensity—though I think that if all the "data," as he calls it, concerning God's presence in our lives were submitted to a "jury," the "circumstantial evidence" would go far beyond the words "accident" or "coincidence."

I think the Bishop's principal difficulty is that he, like many other persons—some of whom have become outright atheists—was born a skeptic. This is like many physical handicaps with which some persons are afflicted. But some of them overcome this failing and undergo what is called a "change" and sometimes become some of the most ardent believers.

But let us examine not the concept to which Bishop Pike clings, but the concept which the believer in the omnipotence of God holds. For to many of us there is actual proof of the existence of God—ample to persuade ourselves even though it may be inadequate to persuade others.

All of us use the word "conscience." We talk of the "spirit" within us and we know that life departs when death comes. But even though we cannot prove that the spirit lives on, we prefer to believe it is a logical corollary to the mysterious thing we call "life." We derive comfort from such thoughts. Why do we possess them and others do not? Why have we adequate proof

of God's influence in our lives and why do others fail to feel it? We cannot answer that question merely by saying some persons are born with strong bodies and strong minds and others are not. Many educated individuals are skeptics.

We can say this is one of the unexplained mysteries of life. But we can also say that some persons are blessed with powers of imagination and others are not. But why such contrasts? Why weren't all persons created equal, and why are some blind and some cannot see at all?

For my part, I have always accepted a simple explanation—that the human mind is finite. It has limits beyond which we cannot go. But within those limits we have freedom to use our imagination and prove to ourselves that without some guiding influence—which could be called self-discipline—we would all be savages. Yet from the beginning—tens of thousands of years before our modern religions came into being—man was taught to believe that it is wrong to kill, it is wrong to steal, it is right to love and help one's neighbor. We can explain readily the need for discipline in human society, but why should we assume that the inspiration for it has no divine origin? For at least it was a common inspiration experienced by all mankind. It exists. Our finite minds may be unable to "prove" or "verify" that this power came from beyond our lives. But what is "proof"?

Each person has a record of his own experience—a memory of the vicissitudes of life in which suffering almost beyond human endurance was encountered. Adversity has been frequent. Yet the persistent help that came from "Somewhere" kept us going. I have referred in one of my talks here to the word "Something" which has been felt by every faith or religion in the world as a meaningful synonym for God.

To me, the supernatural is the area beyond our finite minds—we cannot "prove" its existence, but we are convinced just the same that it has a relationship to us. For we feel its influence every day, and we try to help others to feel it, too, by using the very opposite of the reasoning that Bishop Pike invokes. We do not ask for "proof" of the "existence" of God. We feel it.

But then, it may be asked, why does God permit the disorder which prevails in the world and the mishaps that befall many individuals? I remember getting the impression from an early reading of the Old Testament that the excesses and destruction which came to Sodom and Gomorrah were the direct result of man's immoral behavior and constituted a dramatic punishment.

Many persons may be unable to relate the adversity they themselves encounter to misdeeds of their own or their fellow man. We are responsible, however, not merely for our own behavior but for the behavior of the people of our own country and of other countries in the world. We are under constant obligation to help to improve the life of our brethren and to do for others what we would hope they might do for us if we become similarly afflicted.

We have food. Do we share it with others? Are there not sacrifices we must make to help other human beings?

But, introspectively, what is the inspiration for that which we do in our own lives? Is it just a coincidence that ill luck follows a period of indifference to or neglect of others? Is it just a coincidence that as we go out of our way to help others, a light comes to us as we see a solution to some of our day-by-day problems? Who has not actually had what we call a "break" or a "good piece of luck"? We speak of it as coming "out of a clear sky." We cannot "prove" that God challenged us to show our gratitude in our deeds for others. We cannot prove that he has given this nation so many advantages

September 16, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21865

above other nations because he expected us to be worthy of such beneficence and do things for others, whether indeed we even know them personally. But in our hearts we can feel God's presence if we have the imagination and even the logic to understand the great opportunity afforded us by a living God.

There is one word whose meaning may be interpreted differently by different persons, but in our own consciences we know what it means. I refer to the word "sin." If we break the Lord's Commandments, we should not be surprised when punishment or "hard luck" comes along. When we free ourselves of sin, we know we are happier. Is that state of well-being accidental, or is it the result of the imagination which tells us that good deeds have their own reward and bad deeds have their own punishment?

Bishop Pike has had a variegated career. He was born a Roman Catholic, attended a Jesuit college, became an agnostic, and then turned to the Episcopal Church, where his sermons have been the subject of much controversy for many years.

I feel sorry that Bishop Pike has been unable to achieve peace of mind. He apparently feels frustrated. We should pray for him. Recently his son committed suicide. The United Press International says that an inquiry later indicated the youth had been plagued by philosophical doubts about the meaning of life.

I have heard men who were the victims of misfortune in life exclaim, "Why has He done this to me?" I remember one atheist who had been a religious man nearly all his life, but when his wife was taken from him, he never forgave God and became bitter. He never imagined that there could be a life beyond in which his wife would await him.

Let us thank God that He gave us the imagination to understand His omniscience, His omnipotence, and above all, that a selfish, thoughtless, heartless human being can emerge from his unhappiness and discover God. It has happened, and it will happen again and again, provided we do our part. For as we read in John, Fourth Chapter, 24th Verse:

"God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

VIETNAMESE ELECTION VICTORY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the people of South Vietnam scored a decisive victory for the cause of independence against Communist aggression in their massive turnout at the polls.

Among the first newspapers to comment on the size of the vote were the Washington Daily News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, and the New York Times.

Both recall on their editorial pages the strong Vietcong effort to intimidate the South Vietnamese and hold down the vote. That effort was thoroughly frustrated.

In the view of the Daily News, the meaning of the election is that millions of Vietnamese overcame skepticism and fear of Vietcong retaliation to register their faith in a non-Communist future.

And in the opinion of the Times, the election represented a success for Premier Ky's government and, indirectly, for the Johnson administration. The ideals for which the United States stands, the Times said, gained a point.

I ask unanimous consent that both editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 12, 1966]

SMASHING VICTORY IN VIETNAM

What took place in South Viet Nam yesterday was the most reassuring, progressive and promising thing that has happened there in years. Surpassing all predictions, over three-fourths of the country's registered voters went to the polls to elect a national assembly. The enormous turnout means a smashing victory for the Saigon government and a clear defeat for the communists.

For weeks communist agents, following Hanoi's line, had been calling on South Vietnamese to boycott and "crush" the "sham elections," and backed up their demand with threatened, and actual, terror attacks. The militant Buddhist monks also tried to undercut the elections by urging on followers "non-co-operation" toward the balloting.

The names of yesterday's winners won't be known until later this week, but the massive turnout, witnessed and verified by a host of foreign observers, means a government victory. By that we don't mean, necessarily, a victory for Prime Minister Ky and the ruling generals. We mean a declaration of loyalty to and faith in those men in authority who, for all their faults and shortcomings, represent the non-communist alternative.

We have long believed the South Vietnamese people are basically against the Viet Cong, because they know their aims and their methods. Despite many disappointments, they are disposed to look to Saigon for the answer to the communists. That is what this election means: that millions of Vietnamese overcame their skepticism and apathy—and fear of Viet Cong retaliation—to register their faith in a non-communist future for their country.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 12, 1966]

SAIGON'S ELECTORAL VICTORY

The elections in South Vietnam were a success for Marshal Ky's Government and indirectly for the Johnson Administration. According to present available figures, three-quarters of the eligible voters cast ballots. This far exceeds Vietnamese and American hopes before election day.

The victory deserves full acknowledgement, but its effects should not be exaggerated. Candidates were merely elected to an assembly which will draw up a constitution leading to still another election in 1967 or 1968 for as representative a government as the situation and political backwardness of the people will permit.

Since large regions of South Vietnam are under Vietcong control, or subject to the Vietcong's threats, the election could not lead to a genuine popular majority. But, insofar as the South Vietnamese people, at this stage of their history could record a democratic vote, they have done so.

Marshal Ky, himself, has been an in-again-out-again candidate for the office of an elected president, but it is obvious that any future government would have to be either military or, if civilian, willing to prosecute the war. The conflict will go on pretty much as if the election, despite its undoubted value and success, had not taken place.

Hanoi's inflexible rejection of President Johnson's offer of a mutually agreed withdrawal of troops from South Vietnam shows that neither the time nor the circumstances are ripe for negotiations or a truce.

The block on the road to peace has been made clear again and again by both sides, as it was in the recent exchange. The United States says that Hanoi is the aggressor and North Vietnam says that Washington is the aggressor. Behind the simple accusations are all the complex forces of power politics, ideology, nationalism and emotions that make

the war in Vietnam so stubborn and, for the moment, so intractable.

Yet, the effort to solve it and to bring about negotiations must go on. The United States cannot assume that Hanoi literally means, and always will mean, exactly what it says today. North Vietnam may one day accept the fact that the United States really intends to withdraw from Southeast Asia when circumstances permit, and Hanoi may also hope that the American escalation of the war will not continue to a point of no return.

In the diplomatic game that goes on behind the crack of guns and thunder of bombs, the ideals for which the United States stands gained a point in yesterday's election. The Vietcong, the North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists lost by the same margin. The war goes on, but it has been proved that three out of four of those who could vote in South Vietnam braved danger and future risk to do so, and thereby expressed either support for or acquiescence in what the Saigon Government is trying to do.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

REDUCTION OF U.S. FORCES IN EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed this possibility with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DRISKEN], the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. EAVIN], and the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and with their concurrence, but only on my own initiative, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 300, presently over under the rule, be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reason for taking this action is that, on the next legislative day, it would automatically become the pending order of business during the morning hour and, at the conclusion of the morning hour, would automatically go to the calendar.

It is not my intention to call this up before the latter part of this month or the first part of next month. No one's rights are being violated. Everyone's rights are being protected. I thought this would be the best way in which to handle this particular matter at this particular time.

Mr. President, I have been reading some stories relative to a proposal by a number of Senators to substantially reduce the number of troops in Europe. I see in those stories such words as

21866

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 16, 1966

"probe," and "unnamed sources" being used; one particular statement says in reference to this resolution:

However, although the disparity is marked—

That is between our contributions and the contributions of the European NATO nations—

they say European defense efforts are increasing and any move now to "punish" Europe by withdrawing four or five United States divisions would be foolish.

I do not know who the author of this statement is. I do not know who drew the conclusion that we had suggested the withdrawal of four or five U.S. divisions from Europe.

I believe the resolution itself quotes the word "substantial" and leaves a determination as to what "substantial" means to the President of the United States. But it is interesting to read these stories from time to time.

A story appears in the press today to the effect that certain unnamed "U.S. officials" are opposed to the Senate sense resolution regarding a reduction in U.S. troops deployments in Europe. This opposition is reportedly based on concern that cuts may lead to "Soviet probes" against Western Europe. May I say, Mr. President, Soviet probes are always a possibility in Europe and elsewhere, whether or not there are cuts. They are a possibility whether there are one, two, three, four, or five U.S. divisions stationed in Western Europe. There have been, in fact, periodic Soviet probes during the period that six U.S. divisions have been present in Europe and without even the whisper of cuts.

There are any number of other dire possibilities in Europe which might grow out of U.S. cuts. The Albanians may be emboldened to move against the Yugoslavs or the Greeks. The Austrians may decide to retake the Tyrol from Italy. The East Germans may probe against the West Germans or the West Germans may probe against the East Germans. The catalog of the dire consequences which might flow from any move with respect to Europe can be as endless as the imagination of the cataloger. It is always possible to find not one but a dozen reasons for inertia, for doing nothing, even when changed circumstances clearly urge adjustment in what has been a long and unadjusted approach. I would suggest, however, that doing nothing also may produce its own catalog of dire consequences and not only in Europe.

I repeat what I have said on previous occasions. The Senators who introduced this resolution examined the reasonable possibilities most carefully in the light of their understanding of present circumstances. They examined these possibilities soberly. They reached a sober conclusion. They expressed that conclusion in a sober resolution. That resolution is entitled to sober consideration in the Senate.

The right, indeed, the responsibility of those who disagree to argue responsibility against the resolution is unquestioned. The opportunity for Senators to do so will be presented when this matter is considered on the floor or in commit-

tee or committees as the Senate may decide. The right of others to criticize can be expressed in any of the many available forums of public opinion and the use of these forums by any official of the executive branch of this Government is not questioned.

I most certainly question, however, the validity of any criticism from those public officials who hide behind such innominates as "U.S. officials." Why is it necessary to "decline to be identified" in criticizing a proposal of this kind? Either these "U.S. officials" speak for this Government or they do not. If they are speaking in accord with the policy of the President of the United States they ought to have no compunctions about identifying themselves. If that is not the case, then they ought not to be talking in the first place.

How is the criticism of unknown officials to be evaluated? Does it come from a relevant or irrelevant source? Is it an interested or disinterested source? Are ancient axes being ground in this criticism? These are valid questions whenever animosity is the sponsor of criticism.

May I say that those who offered this resolution claim no great expertness. They are, however, a relevant party to the question. They have, not only the right, but the obligation, as Senators, to think and to speak on a matter which is involved repeatedly and deeply in the votes which they cast in accordance with the Constitution.

The sponsors of this resolution do not hide their identity under innominates. They are not "unnamed officials," either high or low. They are not "certain Senators, influential or uninfluential." They are simply Senators of their States and the United States whose names are: MANSFIELD, RUSSELL LONG, SMATHERS, HILL, RICHARD RUSSELL, HAYDEN, MAGNUSON, PASTORE, SYMINGTON, MUSKIE, HART, BREWSTER, and INOUYE.

Nor do the cosponsors of this resolution seek anonymity. Their names are known. They are: Senators MORSE, TALMADGE, PROXMIRE, BURDICK, GRUENING, MCINTYRE, FULBRIGHT, DOMINICK, MILTON YOUNG, EDWARD LONG, PEARSON, YARBOROUGH, and ROBERT BYRD.

When this resolution is voted upon, moreover, not only the sponsors and cosponsors but all Senators who favor it or oppose it will stand up to be counted one way or another.

So, Mr. President, let me say again: I recognize that there are risks in this resolution even as there are in any course of action or inaction in foreign relations. There are arguments against this resolution as well as arguments for it. Let them all be heard. Let them be discussed. But let those who argue against the resolution not discredit their own opposition by resort to the "leaked story," to the "background press conference," to the unnamed "official source."

I ask unanimous consent that news articles on this matter be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Sept. 16, 1966]
WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. FORCE IS OPPOSED—OFFICIALS FEAR EUROPE MAY BE LEFT OPEN TO RED MOVES

WASHINGTON, September 15.—United States officials cautioned today that if American troops are withdrawn from Europe in any substantial numbers, Russia might take advantage of Western weakness.

None of the West European countries appears ready to take up the slack that would be left by a large United States troop withdrawal, the officials said. Many North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries could not increase their armed forces quickly enough because of serious economic and political problems, it was explained.

TOP SIGNERS

The officials, although declining to be named, were replying in effect to a Senate Democratic Policy Committee proposal that the United States reduce its troops in Europe and give the allies a chance to fill their original troop quotas.

The committee's proposal was made September 1 and co-signed by thirteen Senators, including Senator MANSFIELD (D., Mont.), Democratic leader Senator RUSSELL (D., Ga.), and the Senate Democratic whip, Senator LONG (D., La.).

But officials said today that if there is to be any troop adjustment in NATO, United States troops must be maintained at full strength during that period.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 16, 1966]
ADMINISTRATION BARS TROOP CUT IN EUROPE
(By Benjamin Welles)

WASHINGTON, September 15.—United States officials warned today that major troop cuts in Europe—as recently proposed by the Senate Democratic Policy Committee—might precipitate Soviet "probes" and thereby endanger the West's defensive flank.

The warning was regarded as a rebuttal of contentions by the Senate Majority Leader, MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, and influential Congressional allies that a "substantial" troop cut could be made in Europe "without adversely affecting either our resolve or ability" to meet our North Atlantic treaty commitments.

In rebuttal, Government officials who declined to be identified made it clear that there was no intention at this time on the part of the United States to reduce in any appreciable degree the force of five combat divisions and three armored regiments that have been guarding Europe since the Korean War.

There may be "adjustments," one source said, but there will be no significant troop withdrawals so long as the Soviet Union retains 20 divisions in East Germany.

Mr. MANSFIELD has been urging a reduction of American forces in Europe in recent months. On August 3 he and other members of the powerful Democratic Policy Committee created a stir in official Washington by urging such cuts in a resolution.

Although Mr. MANSFIELD and his co-sponsors avoided specific figures in calling for a "substantial" reduction in the American troop contribution to NATO, their move was quickly countered by the White House. Bill D. Moyers, Presidential press secretary, told newsmen that Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara had promptly informed the Senator that the proposal would "not be helpful at this time."

The emphasis officials placed today on denying all thought of major troop cuts was seen, too, as deliberate reassurance to NATO allies on the eve of the visit here of Chancellor Erhard of West Germany. He is scheduled to confer with President Johnson and Cabinet officials starting Sept. 26.

One of the key problems confronting the two governments is how to resolve the thorny

September 16, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4831

tions at a dinner by the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. The honor was certainly well-deserved.

Presently, Lithuanians, particularly those in the United States, are expending almost their total energies to have the case of Lithuania and her sister nations heard before the United Nations. They are hopeful that our Congress will pass and adopt a resolution which will have our President direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and other appropriate international forums to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the Baltic Nations and bring the force of that world opinion to bear upon the Soviet for the ultimate restoration of their independence. Many representatives introduced such resolutions but we are happy to state that it was our honored guest who submitted House Concurrent Resolution No. 418 which was unanimously approved by the House Foreign Relations Committee on June 21, 1965 and adopted by the House of Representatives on June 21, 1965 by a record vote of 298 yeas and No nays. Would that we had such a determined friend for the passage of a similar resolution by the Senate:

To Lithuanians, our honored guest has never been a stranger. To them, he has always been free with his advice and counsel in the solution of their personal, organizational and national problems. No time has ever been so precious that he could not attend the many events and testimonials of St. Joseph's Parish in Waterbury, the religious and patriotic observances of the Lithuanian American Council, the Knights of Lithuania and other Lithuanian organizations. In fact, it was at a Knights of Lithuania District Convention that we first met Congressman MONAGAN and at this time we discussed strategies that might be used for Lithuania's aid in her struggle for freedom.

Because of his intense love for Lithuania and her people, because of his firm conviction that the subjugation and exploitation of Lithuania constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights and therefore an impediment to the promotion of total world peace and cooperation, because of his readiness to dedicate his energies and abilities in behalf of Lithuania's present fight for freedom, because of his untiring efforts to bring about the downfall of the evil of communism, because not by mere words but by concrete action he has demonstrated himself on numerous occasions to be a real friend of Lithuania, it is now a high honor and a distinct privilege for me to present, with the approval and in behalf of the Officers and members of the Knights of Lithuania Youth Organization, the Knights of Lithuania Award Medal to a real friend of Lithuania, the distinguished and highly regarded Representative of the fifth Congressional District of the State of Connecticut, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN.

Address of President Marcos of the Republic of the Philippines to Joint Session of Congress

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 17, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Ferdinand E. Marcos, President of the Republic of the Philippines, has just completed his official visit to Washington. Although

greeted by a deluge of rain, President Marcos and his lovely wife, with their charm and graciousness, brought warmth and light to our Federal City. Anyone who has had the opportunity to meet and know these charming people is richer for the experience.

President Marcos is the able leader of a proud nation. Throughout his relatively young life he has displayed great courage and intelligence. He survived the Bataan death march and then went on to build an outstanding record as a guerrilla commander against the Japanese in World War II. We can anticipate that he will guide the destiny of his country in a similar courageous and resourceful manner.

The freedom loving people of Asia need such a leader around whom they can rally. I am sure President Marcos will provide that leadership if properly assisted by the other free nations.

In his eloquent address before the joint session of the U.S. Congress on September 15, 1966, President Marcos presented a lucid insight into Asian politics and problems. Moreover, he clearly delineated America's role in helping to develop and strengthen the government posture of the free nations of Asia.

If some in this country don't know why the United States is committed to assisting South Vietnam in her struggle against aggression, it is clearly understood by the Asians. As President Marcos said:

The war in Viet Nam agitates the whole world and has brought into sharp focus the problems of Asian security. We stand with America in maintaining that aggression, whether perpetrated openly or by proxy, must be deterred and defeated, that all nations, Asian or not, are entitled to freedom from fear of subversion or overt attack, that they should have the period of peace they need to attend, unmolested, to their urgent tasks of economic and social development.

I, for one, am grateful to President Marcos for his thoughtful and enlightening report to the people of America. As President Marcos so vividly pointed out, the United States is the leader nation of the free world and cannot resign or fail to meet her responsibilities in Asia. I sincerely share with our good friend, President Marcos, this conviction. As he said:

America, the time has not yet come for you to lay down the heavy burden of leadership.

Bristol, England, Sketch Comments on the War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 6, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it was very encouraging to read in the Bristol, Virginia-Tennessee, Herald Courier a reprint of an article from the Bristol, England, Sketch, which acknowledge support of our fighting men in Vietnam.

With gratitude in behalf of all of us, I insert these remarks at this point in the RECORD:

ON THE SAME SIDE

Of the many problems associated with Viet Nam, perhaps the most galling to patriotic Americans is the lackadaisical attitude assumed by this nation's allies. Great Britain has been notably apathetic in support of the United States and the Wilson Government is under attack in this country for allowing English ships to trade with the Communist North Vietnamese.

It is heartening, then, to realize that the English can understand why the United States is compelled to fight in Southeast Asia. In a recent edition, the Bristol, England, Sketch eloquently set down a line of thinking which is hopefully more prevalent among the British people than official policy indicates.

The editorial:

"The sky over England 26 years ago, was laced with vapor trails as the Spitfires and Hurricanes went up to meet the Luftwaffe. Then came the heavier drone of the Wellingtons carrying the war into France and Germany.

"Not all of them returned.

"The vapor-trails and the drone of bombers are far away this summer, in the sky over Viet Nam. But the fear and the courage do not change. The heart-clutching tension and the heart-breaking sorrow are the same.

"The Americans have already lost 339 aircraft over North Viet Nam. An entire squadron of Thunderchief fighter-bombers has been wiped out, most of them during the past few days.

"About 670 sorties are flown each day. An American airman in Viet Nam must expect to be shot down before he reaches his 60th sortie; and unless the rescuing helicopters can pick him up quickly, he will fall into the hands of the Viet Cong.

"The risks are made greater because the Americans take care to attack only military targets—the targets most hotly protected by anti-aircraft fire and Russian ground-to-air missiles.

"The American pilots are brave and dedicated, just as ours were 26 years ago. They believe, as ours believed, that they are risking their lives in defense of freedom and against international banditry.

"Like ours, they have families waiting at home, haunted all day long by fear of the news which a ring of the doorbell may bring.

"America is at war. We ought to understand what it means; and therefore to understand why the Americans do not take kindly to carping and sniping from their allies or to the half-support offered by Harold Wilson.

"They are fighting, as they see it, as much on our behalf as on their own.

"The least we can do is recognize their determination, salute their courage and show, without qualification, that we are on the same side."

Bristolians in Virginia and Tennessee owe Bristolians in England a note of thanks. These words from a sister city across the sea are balm for the anguish and anxiety of a people at war.

Stringent Bombing Bill Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, station WIND in Chicago has performed a nota-

A4832

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 16, 1966

ble public service by repeatedly calling for strong measures to prevent bombings of public and private property in this country.

It is a tragic fact that my own city of Chicago has suffered the effects of more than 100 bombings in the last 2 years. Presumably those who set these bombs come into a strange city from out of State, ignite the bombs and disappear to another city or another State before the local authorities have an opportunity to apprehend them.

The vast resources of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice would help immeasurably in tracking these felons down and bringing them to court to answer for their crimes.

We must give our law-enforcement agencies the Federal assistance they need to help solve these bombings. I have sponsored legislation to provide such assistance and, in an era of increasing trends toward violence, I believe we must take direct action to stop such bombings of private and public property.

Mr. Speaker, following are the WIND editorials which speak so eloquently of the need for positive and immediate Federal assistance:

[Broadcast Wednesday, Aug. 17, 1966, by Edward Wallis, general manager, Station WIND, Chicago, Ill.]

STRINGENT BOMBING BILL NEEDED

Over the years Chicago has suffered bombings running into the hundreds. After a lull of a few months, two more bombings took place last week. The criminals who have perpetrated these crimes against the citizens of this area are still free to wreck further property damage and possible death or injury.

Because the bombers seem to be able to operate with impunity, we suggest that stronger measures to halt their nefarious work and to bring them to justice are needed. The strongest possible measure would be that of making such crimes federal offenses, and establishing the most stringent penalties possible under federal law. A bill to do this very thing has been kicking around in committee in Washington for weeks. It was introduced by Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI of Illinois and provides that any bombing is a matter for federal jurisdiction.

As things stand now, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other federal authorities must stand by helplessly in most bombing cases because there has been no violation of federal law. We think it's time to change this situation and to throw the power of the federal government into apprehending and punishing the bombers.

At the local level, authorities have proven virtually helpless in dealing with this offense. The power of the FBI, it seems to us, is needed now. We point out that prior to the passage of legislation making kidnapping a federal offense, this crime was much more prevalent than it is now. We believe the same results could be achieved with a national bombing law.

We urge action on Representative PUCINSKI's bombing bill without further delay.

STRONGER PENALTIES NEEDED FOR BOMBERS

(Broadcast Thursday, Aug. 25, 1966, by Edward Wallis, general manager, station WIND, Chicago, Ill.)

An attempt to take the life of the Superintendent of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago by wiring dynamite to the ignition system of his automobile is just one more shocking evidence of the immunity of bombers to apprehension and conviction.

The attempt on the life of Vinton W. Bacon is more than an attack on one individual. It is an attack on integrity in Public Office. It is flaunting the power of underworld tie-ups with political life. Attempts to "Get Bacon" up to now have been confined to efforts to oust him from his job. Now, the "Get Bacon" movement has taken on a sinister complexion, with an abortive effort to commit murder.

Last week, we editorialized on the necessity for federal legislation to deal with the crime of bombing, because local authorities seem unable to cope with the hundreds of bombing crimes which have plagued our community. This latest shocking incident further underscores the necessity for such legislation.

There is no way of guessing the identity of the person or persons who tried to kill Vinton W. Bacon, because his policies of honesty and integrity in public office have made him countless personal enemies.

Whether this is the work of the criminal syndicate, or of a single disgruntled person is a matter for law enforcement officers to discover and follow up. But, if the past history of unsolved bombings is any barometer, it's a safe assumption that the odds are a thousand to one that the criminal or criminals will never be apprehended.

Bombings, and attempted bombings, should be a matter for federal jurisdiction and prosecution. The power of the FBI, backed by stringent penalties under federal law, could cope with such shocking and revolting incidents as this attempt on the life of Vinton W. Bacon. Local and state authorities have proven their impotence under local and state laws to deal with bombing. It's time for passage of the Pucinski bill to make bombings a federal offense.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).